UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

A Tribute to William E. Borah

Editorial

"The Grapes of Wrath" - - - - - - - - - - - *Horace Westwood*

Why I Can Have No Part in War - - - - - - - - *W. Waldemar W. Argow*

Indian Freedom and British War Aims - - - - - - - - - - *Taraknath Das*

The Time for Love Has Come

A Poem by Angela Morgan

VOLUME CXXIV NUMBER 11

Chicago, February 5, 1940

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly *Subscription $3.00*
Until Further Notice *Single Copies 15 cents*

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter, May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—

Notes 167
Jottings—J. H. H. 170

ARTICLES—

"The Grapes of Wrath"—HORACE WESTWOOD 170
Why I Can Have No Part in War—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW ... 173
Indian Freedom and British War Aims—TARAKNATH DAS 175
On the Pacifist Front—VIII 176

POETRY—

The Time for Love Has Come—ANGELA MORGAN 174

THE STUDY TABLE—

Lester Ward: "Meliorist"—EMANUEL STERNHEIM 178
Development of Philosophical Thought—CHARLES A. HAWLEY 179

CORRESPONDENCE—

Our Defense Needs—F. S. KINDER 180
Keep Cool!—P. MALOFF 180
The Fight Against Syphilis—RAY LYMAN WILBUR 180

THE FIELD—

I Am a Pacifist—MIRZA AHMAD SOHRAB 166

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

I Am a Pacifist

MIRZA AHMAD SOHRAB

I am a pacifist!
I am a conscientious objector to war!
At the moment, I belong to a tiny minority, yet I feel myself part of a mighty revolt that is surging up from the heart of a disillusioned humanity.
I am a patriot, because I am confident that my nation holds within itself means for the settling of all disputes in a non-violent, non-military way. Hence, I assert that the resources of human nature, if ever given full play by the civil and religious authorities of the world, would be sufficient to bring about permanent security and peace.
I am not a coward nor a shirker in time of hazard.
I do not flee from danger, but remain with it.

I am a pacifist!
I renounce all wars at all times!
I do not believe in the use of physical force as a method for achieving an end, however good.
I refuse to kill a human being on my own account; then why should I, at the word of another or at the order of any power on earth, resort to killing.
I am prepared to die for my faith, just as my brothers are dying for theirs on the fields of battle.

I am a pacifist!
I am not a joyous follower of the evangel of hate; but rather am a humble student of the evangel of love.
I do not assert that my judgment is infallible, but I do profess to know something about the method that I have chosen, which is that of non-violence, and also something about its counterpart, which is that of violence. I believe that both methods are sufficiently well established, as to entitle me to demonstrate the workings of love in the midst of hate, and I pledge myself to as much self-denial and endurance as is assumed by those who apply the contrary way. I am confident that through this means I can make a greater contribution to the peace that follows war.

I am a pacifist!
I say NO to war!
I oppose every war and all preparation for war!
I am not inactive. In my daily life and through my association with my fellowmen I practice friendship and brotherhood. I work with others toward great ends, advocating the cause of the distressed in whatsoever tongue and at whatsoever price. My success will not be immediate, but it is mounting on the wheel of time, just as the success of those who advocate militarism is descending slowly and surely.

I am a pacifist!
I am a citizen of the world!
I strive to maintain my serenity in the midst of anger and my reason at the brink of the abyss. I have faith in the coöperative comradeship of human beings, and back this comradeship

(*Continued on page* 177)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXIV MONDAY, FEBRUARY 5, 1940 No. 11

THEODORE PARKER ON WAR

I think lightly of what is called treason against a government. That may be your duty today, or mine. Certainly it was our fathers' duty not long ago; . . . But treason against the people, against mankind, against God, is a great sin, not lightly to be spoken of.

War, wasting a nation's wealth, depresses the great mass of the people, but serves to elevate a few to opulence and power. Every despotism is established and sustained by war. This is the foundation of all the aristocracies of the old world, aristocracies of blood.

To take one man's life is murder; what is it to practice killing as an art, a trade; to do it by thousands? Yet I think better of the hands that do the butchering than of the ambitious heads, the cold, remorseless hearts, which plunge the nation into war.

It would be a gain to mankind if we could spread over that country the Idea of America—that all men are born free and equal in rights, and establish there political, social, and individual freedom. But to do that, we must first make real these ideas at home.

In regard to the present war, we can refuse to take any part in it; we can encourage others to do the same; we can aid men, if need be, who suffer because they refuse. Men will call us traitors; what then? That hurt nobody in '76! We are a rebellious nation; our whole history is treason, our blood was attainted before we were born; our creeds are infidelity to the mother-church; our Constitution treason to our fatherland. What of that? Though all the governors in the world bid us commit treason against man, and set the example, let us never submit. Let God only be a master to control conscience!

It is not a day for cowardice, but for heroism. Fear not that the "honor of the nation" will suffer from Christian movements for peace. What if your men of low degree are a vanity, and your men of high degree are a lie? That is no new thing. Let true men do their duty, and the lie and the vanity will pass each to its reward. Wait not for the churches to move, or the State to become Christian. Let us bear our testimony like men, not fearing to be called traitors, infidels; fearing only to be such.

AN AMERICAN SENATOR

William E. Borah, dead on January 19th last, was in the great tradition of the United States Senate. He was the one man in his generation who perpetuated the immortal memory of Webster, Clay, Calhoun, Benton, Sumner, and Sherman. His prime quality was a certain granite-like quality of character, which enabled him to stand like a rock on matters of high principle and honor. Next came his massive intellect, which, when taught in matters of constitutional law and foreign affairs, made him an unimpeachable authority in problems of momentous consequence. But it was his oratory which made him the real compeer of the greatest of his predecessors in the senatorial chamber. In an age when commonplace simplicity and a charming radio manner have suddenly become the debased standards of public speech, Borah kept alive and eloquent the classic traditions of Cicero, Burke, and Daniel Webster. To listen to Borah's weighty periods was to be lifted suddenly to levels of exalted vision and cosmic power. His services as a statesman are identified with few great acts of legislation or public policy. His role was rather that of the critic and foe of any betrayal of the people's trust, as in the case of his last speech in ringing attack upon Secretary of the Navy Edison's appeal for war powers in peacetime, and of the unwavering champion of all great causes of righteousness and freedom. Yet in his advocacy of the Outlawry of War he placed himself in the front rank of the world's statesmanship of peace, and in his long and heroic fight against the Versailles Treaty and American involvement in European affairs, saved the nation from sharing the vast catastrophe of this present hour. Senator Borah had his weaknesses—mostly of temperament. Thus, he was a lonely sentinel on the walls rather than a leader of armies in the field. He had a curious way of launching a movement and then failing to follow it through. He showed on occasion a Hamlet-like quality of indecision. He was not infrequently critical rather than constructive. But in a period of world-shaking events he loomed superior to a whole generation of contemporaries in character, eloquence, and sheer weight of influence. More than any man outside the presidency, Borah was the supreme political figure of his day. He must bulk large forever in the history of these times. As for the Senate, it suddenly shrivels to insignificance in the passing of this one man.

A HOLY WAR!

It is incredible to us that anybody should interpret plain speaking about Stalin, denunciation of his policy and compassion for its victims, as meaning the advocacy of war against the Soviets. Yet pacifists, who have been humane enough to express indignation and pity on behalf of Finland, as Communists only yesterday were expressing indignation and pity on behalf of Spain, are actually being accused of warmongering. "You are helping on the movement for a holy war," is the charge. But is this an honest charge, or is it only the latest trick for protecting Russia from the indictment she so

abundantly has earned? Curious, that the fiercest denunciation of German tyranny and Italian totalitarianism and British and Japanese imperialism should still be in order, but denunciation of Russian imperialism be deprecated as propaganda for war! The situation, apart from all predilections and prejudices, is perfectly simple. To the various imperialisms of the world, jointly responsible for the wars now ravaging the world, has been suddenly added a new and unexpected imperialism. Russia under Stalin is seen to be precisely like Germany under Hitler, and Italy under Mussolini, and Britain under Chamberlain, and France under Daladier. This complicates the situation, but otherwise leaves it the same—namely, a world beset by imperialistic governments willingly sacrificing their helpless peoples in the unending struggle to keep, or acquire, empire and dominion upon the earth. The pacifist knows this struggle for what it is, and for this reason, among others, is unqualifiedly opposed to war. The sudden disclosure of Russia's perfidy only strengthens the pacifist's interpretation of events, and reinforces his conviction that he can have no sympathy with or part in the present fighting, or any future fighting. A war against Russia, holy or otherwise, would change not a whit his present attitude toward the war against the Reich, as toward all wars. UNITY—to apply all this doctrine to our own case—is utterly disillusioned about Stalin and the Soviets. UNITY is utterly horrified by the Russian attack upon Finland. But UNITY is swayed not an inch in favor of a holy war. On the contrary, UNITY only reiterates its cry—This is imperialism, This is war! We will have nothing to do with either.

THE RUSSIAN SLAUGHTER

The American people are getting an immense satisfaction out of the Finns' defense of their land against the Russians. They are feeling again the old thrill of Thermopylae and Verdun. Then there is the strange and terrible character of the fighting! What stories of massacre and death, of freezing and flight, of silent forests and icebound lakes, are coming out of this arctic country! Twelve thousand "red" soldiers trapped and butchered—eighteen thousand caught on the ice and mowed down by machine-guns or dumped into the waters by dropping bombs! The temperature 40 degrees below zero, Russian soldiers inadequately clad and shod, their feet so frozen they cannot walk, their hands so chilled they cannot pull a trigger, fugitives wandering among the snow-buried trees and hunted down like animals, corpses as stiff as granite statues, the countryside strewn with unburied bodies like hewn logs! It is "a glorious victory," to quote Southey's ironic phrase. The Finns are working a miracle, and punishing their foes beyond all estimate of suffering and death. *But*—we cannot seem to get our minds off those Russian soldiers, perishing in arctic wastes amid every circumstance of agony. For those soldiers are not soldiers merely. They are schoolboys, young farmers, and peasants, the sons of honest fathers and doting mothers, boys frightened and miserable, ignorant, wondering, and sick for home. These youngsters are not guilty of anything. They never wanted to fight Finland. They never decided in cold blood to invade a neighbor's land and murder its people. We cannot feel any joy over their death. If Stalin, now, were only freezing in these woods, as Napoleon froze in the Russian snows when he put himself at the head of his French army to capture Moscow! But Stalin will never come within a thousand miles of the Finnish front. This butchery may go on all winter, myriads of innocent "red" youth may perish horribly, and the Kremlin dictator will eat and sleep comfortably as he orders more and still more lads to die in the ice and snow. What are we to think of a workers' government which drives its own people to this torture and death, to say nothing of the Finns thus challenged to the extremity of desperate defense of their home and country? In the name of Stalin's own people, this war stands damned forever. And with it all wars forevermore.

THE PROPOSAL FOR INCREASED ARMAMENTS

It is a good thing to have the pacifist fight centered upon one thing—this abominable proposal to spend hundreds of millions of more dollars for what is called "national defense." Hitherto the pacifists have been firing more or less at random—against war in general, against the possible entrance of the United States into the European war, against the weakening of our neutrality legislation. It has all been vague, indefinite, remote! But here is an issue made for the pacifist campaign—an issue as concrete as a piece of steel. Pacifists are opposed to armaments on principle. They know, on the basis of an unbroken historical record, that armaments lead to the very war they are supposed to prevent. But here is a proposal for armaments unjustified even on the militarist's familiar plea of preparedness. For this country is not in any danger. No country is planning to attack us, or would be able to do so if it so desired. The one most popular fear seems to be of an attack from the air. Hence the wild talk about more airplanes, more anti-aircraft guns, and what not. But are we learning nothing from Europe? Here is Germany unable to bomb Britain effectively because her air bases are so far from British shores. It seems agreed that sooner or later the Reich will invade Holland, so as to get possession of the Dutch flying-fields which will enable her to launch her fleets effectively into the air. A few hundred miles, in other words, are strategically important in enabling Germany to reach England with her bombers. And the distance between Europe and our American shores is a matter not of hundreds but of thousands of miles! The same thing applies to soldiers and ships. Just try to draw a pic-

ture of a nation shipping across the Atlantic or the Pacific an army capable of conquering and holding this territory! Are we crazy that we can dream of such a thing? And speaking of increases, what has been done with the hundreds of millions of dollars already expended for armaments, that we are still so completely unprepared, according to the testimony of army and naval officers? This whole program is madness. If the pacifists do not unite against it, and fight it to utter and final defeat, they are unworthy of their opportunity.

THE DIES COMMITTEE

Chairman Dies keeps right on giving ammunition to the very considerable body of Americans, especially the liberals, who believe that the Dies Committee has been conducting a witch-hunt which ought to be discontinued forthwith. On the other hand, the second report of the Committee, just presented to Congress, proves to be a document which is impressive. The controversy over the question of whether or not to continue this investigation is one of the furious political storms of the winter. As usual, in situations of this kind the American Civil Liberties Union comes forward with a report as sane as it is impartial and free. Opposing the continuance of the Dies Committee for reasons carefully laid down which constitute a severe indictment of methods, and practises of the Committee, very especially including the Chairman, the Union goes on to describe the kind of investigation which might well be conducted in this instance—"an investigation preferably by a non-political fact-finding commission, or by the Senate and House jointly." Toward the work of the Dies Committee itself, especially in its second year, the American Civil Liberties Union is fair as no other liberal body that we chance to know of has been fair. Thus, it states that the Dies Committee "has brought together in one place a review of material which gives the American people some idea of the extent . . . of the movements in the United States which are inimical to democracy." It has "revealed activities which are proper subjects of investigation." The Dies Committee "has shown that many individuals and organizations, under the guise of patriotism, would destroy all democratic institutions, aiming particularly at the Bill of Rights and laws protecting labor unions." The Committee "has made the American people aware of the real and undemocratic purposes of many groups masquerading as patriotic or democratic." The Civil Liberties Union then goes on to make this statement:

> There is evidence in the record [of the Dies Committee] that some of the organizations investigated are responsible to, or dominated by, or in some measure aided by, foreign governments, whose apparent object is to destroy or weaken our democracy, or to set up in its place some form of Nazi, Fascist or Communist dictatorship.

Once again the American Civil Liberties Union has given guidance to all liberty-loving Americans.

SCIENCE—IT'S WONDERFUL!

There are other things beside Father Divine's peace that are wonderful and among these are science. The things that scientists will do—the questions they will investigate, with solemn visage and scrupulously exact procedure! Here are two scientists, for example—it took *two* to do this job!—who investigated the momentous question as to whether dance-band leaders make good or bad husbands. The savants, one of Leland Stanford University and the other of San Francisco State College, sent out questionnaires to a hundred successful band leaders, and on the answers received based their conclusions. And what were these conclusions? That the dance-band musicians led "very non-typical lives;" that

> . . . their working activities are such that all their other activities are affected. Working conditions determine how, when, and where these men eat and sleep. They enforce an average of at least ten changes of residence a year. They offer no economic security. And they preclude quite largely the achievement of family, home, or friends outside the occupation, as roots of a stable existence.

Other conclusions laid stress on the fact that, as the band leader is frequently moving from place to place, "if he has children, he leaves his wife behind and sees her when he can." There is also the fact that the bandsman is "subject to none of the usual community checks and is thrown by the character of his work into temporary associations with members of the other sex," with the natural results. All of which is interesting, no doubt. But why did it need an elaborate scientific investigation to uncover these facts? Questionnaires, classification and codification of replies—what did such methods reveal that was not already known, or at least obvious to the casual observer? Instead of staying in their laboratories or studies, why did these two inquisitorial professors not go to a typical night-club and take a look at the band leader and his devotees? Wouldn't they have found at one glance what scientific inquiry could only verify? Indeed, would not any one of us have said, offhand, just the things which are so pontifically set down in this official report? There are such things, after all, as common sense and human experience. But we suppose our scientific researchers have to keep themselves busy at something, and it might as well be dance-band leaders as junebugs or the use of the subjunctive mood in Terence. But, after all, perhaps this is an instance of applied science. Which takes us back to where we started—science, it's wonderful!

THE BOSTON COMMUNITY CHURCH
(1920-1940)

The twentieth anniversary of the Boston Community Church, celebrated last month, is something worth thinking about. This is an age of depleted and struggling churches. Ever since the Great War, organized religion has been having a hard time of it. Especially has church attendance been hard hit. Amid such con-

ditions the Boston Community Church was founded and has flourished. Meeting in the great Symphony Hall, much after the fashion of the historic Theodore Parker congregation in the old Music Hall, this church gathers from Sunday to Sunday what is unquestionably the largest liberal congregation in the country, perhaps in the world. On occasion it packs the Symphony Hall auditorium with close to three thousand people—capacity!—and if the audience on a Sunday falls as low as a thousand or twelve hundred, the officers get worried and wonder what is the matter. The great success and potent influence of this church may be attributed to certain distinctive aspects of its life. Thus, it has no regular preacher, but opens its pulpit to a succession of the ablest speakers of the day, to talk upon great questions of public interest. These speakers include men and women, clergymen and laymen, orthodox and liberals, conservatives and radicals. There is no freer pulpit in America. Secondly, the Boston Community Church, as its name signifies, has put aside all denominational affiliations, and organized its life upon an out-and-out community basis. It has thus become an institution not apart from, but rather a part of, the common life of man. It is interested in fellowship, which is universal in the sense that it knows not sect, class, nation, or race. Again, this Boston church lays emphasis upon the social aspects of religion. It is supremely interested in "doing something about it." So instead of organizing parish societies, it organizes social action committees to concern themselves with fighting evil and fostering good in the community. Its interests are as wide as the life of man, and its spirit the militant spirit of justice and brotherhood. In his anniversary sermon, the Reverend John Haynes Holmes, spoke of the Boston Community Church as "the church of the future. I have little confidence," he said, "in the historic churches, either Catholic, Protestant, or even liberal. They will last for a long time, and do much good. But this crisis spells the coming of a new age. And a new age means a new church."

Jottings

Lord Lothian, the British Ambassador, declares that Britain is not "trying to drag [us] into this war." Page Mr. Duff-Cooper, please! He hasn't heard the news.

We rejoice that the President has recommended new taxes to pay for his new and vast expenditures for armaments. That's the talk! If the people are going to support this useless waste of money for army and navy increases not in any sense needed, then let them fork out the money, and not lay the burden on their children and children's children.

It is announced that Germany is arranging to come to the help of Russia in Finland. We have never read that the shepherd-boy, David, had to fight against two Goliaths. But we haven't a doubt he could have done it.

Curious, how the spy and putsch panics always break out when big armament bills are up in Congress! In the latest New York excitement, so ridiculous on the face of things, Mr. J. Edgar Hoover bids us remember that "it took only twenty-three men to overthrow Russia." Imagine—comparing Russia in March, 1917, with the United States of America in January, 1940!

In the new British "Who's Who" for 1940, an authoritative collection of self-written biographies of famous men throughout the world, the longest biography is that of Nicholas Murray Butler—longer than the biographies of Roosevelt, Chamberlain, Mussolini, and Hitler put together. There is the measure of the man!

The Pope is a lover of peace, but evidently no conscientious objector to war. Thus, in a recent letter of instruction to the Catholic clergy, he urged all priests called to the colors by the belligerent powers to obey the military authorities.

J. H. H.

"The Grapes of Wrath"*

HORACE WESTWOOD

Tom Joad had been in jail. In a fight with another man who had knifed him, he had committed manslaughter. Sentenced for seven years he had been released on parole at the end of four. And now he sought to return home. But there was no home, because his people had been driven from the land. For three generations, since the days of the Indians, they had lived on their farm. Sturdy, industrious, thrifty and independent, they had pioneered in Oklahoma and for the first generation all had gone well. But gradually, through circumstances and natural conditions for which they were not primarily responsible—drought, dust storms and crop failures—they had been brought to the verge of destitution. Debt piled on debt had resulted in mortgage, transfer of ownership to the bank and then to large land-holding corporations. Thus the Joads became tenants on the land they had once owned. But tenant farming in terms of small holdings brought little or no returns to the large and new owners. Moreover, machine power in the tilling of the soil proved

*First delivered as a lecture in the First Unitarian Church, Berkeley, California.

more profitable than man power, and machine power could only be made to pay on large acreages. Therefore the day came when the Joads were forced from off the land. It was seemingly inevitable. No particular individual was to blame. Natural forces and a new set of economic conditions had brought it to pass.

However, on the morning when Tom returned, the home of his forbears was no more and he found his family taking temporary refuge with his uncle John prior to migration to California. He arrived with Casy, a former itinerant preacher belonging to the more extravagant gospel sects, in time for breakfast, and for a time stood watching his mother as she prepared the meal. Steinbeck's description of the meeting of mother and son is one of the most beautiful things I have ever read and his delineation of "Ma" as he calls her is one of the most remarkable pen portraits in modern literature.

Tom had arrived only just in time, for at dawn on the day after the family began the long trek to California. They had sold all they had. The household and farm goods had gone for eighteen dollars. Their total assets for a family of eight amounted to less than one hundred and fifty dollars. For seventy-five dollars they had bought an old Hudson which they transformed into a truck. So we are made to see the family, plus the two grandparents, plus the son-in-law, plus the uncle, plus Casy, thirteen persons in all, piling into the already heavily laden truck. As the sun rises over the horizon, the adventure begins. They are pilgrims venturing forth to the land of promise, where every man has his little vineyard and fruit grove, and his white painted cottage shaded by trees. There will be no hard winters there. No dust storms, no drought, no menacing floods, no excessive heat and no snow. Moreover the terrible blight of poverty will be no more, for is it not a land of plenty, in which there is enough for all and to spare? Moreover, the crops are so abundantly heavy that there are not enough workers to harvest them—at least that is what they have been told. Above all, there are acres and acres of vacant land, awaiting industrious toil. Thus they set out. "And the truck crawled slowly through the dust toward the highway and the West." There was sadness in their hearts as they bade their old haunts farewell, but there was also the joy of great expectation, for soon their burdens would be lifted and sorrow would be no more.

The process of disillusionment swiftly began. Route 66 over which they traveled revealed all the aspects of a major migration, for thousands of others had the same notion and likewise were journeying to the promised land. Some, they met returning, and these declared that the promise was only a hoax. Besides, trouble soon ensued, Grandpa died and in a few days Grandma followed. The journey proved more expensive than they had thought. Furthermore officialdom harshly frowned upon them—they were tramps, vagabonds, vagrants.

Finally, however, they arrived at Hooverville, a wretched migrant camp made up of shacks and tents, temporary shelters built of sacking and rags, packing cases and cardboard boxes; a place without adequate sanitation and toilet facilities. Hundreds of families were there. Hunger, destitution, filth and disease were evident everywhere. Everyone was out of work. Some had traveled all over the state, from orchard to orchard, from ranch to ranch, getting a few days work here and there, but for wages that were nearly always below the level of subsistence and with children nearly always hungry. Here they were, a motley crowd of wretchedness and abysmal misery awaiting opportunity to work, and finding when it came that it always spelled "exploitation." This was the Joad family's first experience of the welcome of California.

Then came the labor contractor seeking pickers for Tulare County. "What wages?" The contractor refused to say. It might be thirty cents, or it might be a little more or a little less. And when one of the men pressed the inquiry, he was dubbed a red agitator and was arrested by an armed deputy sheriff who was with the contractor. A near riot followed. A woman was shot. Tom became violent and escaped into hiding. In order to allow Tom to escape Casy surrendered himself and went to jail. That night, by stealth and strategy, the Joad family escaped from the camp and shortly afterward found themselves in a government camp. Conditions were so different there. Human beings were not less than cattle. There was decency, order, sanitation, a measure of brotherhood and neighborly kindness. Tom found work for a few days, but only at 25 cents an hour, for though the rancher would willingly have paid 30 he was afraid. For had he not received orders from one of the so-called farmers' associations that the prevailing wage must not be more than 25 cents? And since this association was controlled by the banks, he feared that if he paid more his loan might be called and he would lose his land.

Again, the Joad family was compelled to move on. At last they found work picking peaches under strike conditions. The entire family worked, including the children. The first day the total earnings for an afternoon's work were one dollar which was entirely consumed in food purchased at exorbitant prices at the company store. At the time they entered the company camp, they did not know that they were imported strike breakers and that the wages they received of five cents a basket were twice what the company wanted to pay. Tom attempted to find out all about it and met Casy, who, having left jail, had become the spokesman for the strikers. Casy, endeavoring to plead their cause and with the calm reason characteristic of him, was brutally murdered, and Tom who struck a man in his defense was compelled to hide.

Once more the Joad family—hiding Tom between two mattresses—moved on and by a stroke of luck found jobs picking cotton under slightly better conditions. This time, they lived in a box car on a siding. A flood came—in the midst of which the oldest girl gave birth to a still-born child. The last we see of the family—which now was broken and diminished, despite Ma's heroic courage—is in a barn, where its remaining members had taken shelter from the ravages of the flood.

My reactions to the book are mixed and varied. I must confess to a feeling of distress. When I first read it (and I have done so three times), I felt then—and I have not changed my opinion—that in certain passages it is unnecessarily vulgar and I understand the feeling of those who say that these passages border on the obscene. From the standpoint of realism this reaction will be challenged, but I still maintain that even from the standpoint of realism some intimacies relating to certain human proclivities should be left to the imagination. A description of them can hardly be justified

in the name of art, and offending the susceptibilities of certain types of mind, the end the author had in view is to that extent defeated. This is unfortunate, for the kind of realism to which I refer weakens the author's appeal by placing a weapon in the hands of his enemies. Moreover, it closes the minds of many people for whom the book might otherwise have a much needed message. Undoubtedly Steinbeck's description of the undisciplined naturalism of some of his characters may be perfectly true, but the danger is that it may be regarded as typical of the thousands of migrants who come from Oklahoma, Texas and the dust bowl. This, I do not believe to be true and I cannot escape the conviction that in emphasizing the proclivities of a few individuals, he may have conveyed to the public in general a false picture of the very groups for whom he has sought to arouse sympathy and understanding. For instance, take the character of Casy. In my earlier ministry I met many exhorting evangelists representing his crude form of faith. But I refute the implication that his uncontrolled impulses of passion—as Steinbeck describes them—are typical. And in saying this, I add my tribute to the simple sincerity and true nobility which Casy as a whole reveals.

Having ventured this criticism, I have no hesitation in saying that in my judgment the book is a great and important social document, the meaning of which ought to be pondered by every individual who has the welfare of humanity at heart. As far as my knowledge goes, the social trends and conditions to which the author so eloquently calls attention, have by no means been exaggerated or overdrawn. Books like Carey McWilliams' *Factories in the Field,* articles by reputable writers in such magazines as the *Survey Graphic* and the *Nation,* not to speak of the more conservative publications, abundantly sustain and substantiate what he has written, and even allowing for the truth of much that may be said on the other side, there still remains a picture of injustice, inhumanity, exploitation and selfish iniquity.

Again, it cannot be successfully denied that land monopoly in California is at least partly responsible for some of the evils the novel describes. For let us not be deceived, monopoly in land, according to *Factories in the Field,* is a fact—as it has always been a factor since Mexican days in the agricultural life of the state. It has a long and sordid history behind it—a history which ought to be carefully studied before forming any final opinion on the problem of farm labor in the state. But if what the author of *Factories in the Field* states is true—and his statement appears to be substantially documented—namely, that at one time during the present depression 50 per cent of the farm lands in central and northern California were controlled by one financial institution, we have a situation which in the very nature of the case leaves the door open for many abuses and anti-social practices.

Moreover, his evidence supports the claim that this concentrated power has been used for two purposes: (1) to keep down wages; (2) to prevent organization among the workers who sought to coöperate in order to increase their wages.

The documented history of the past few years reveals tactics of suppression, cruelties and armed intimidation which, if the record be true, are hardly surpassed by the brown shirts of Hitler. Talk about Fascism in Germany—well, its rudiments have been manifest in this very field! It is out of this background that *Grapes of Wrath* has been written.

The plot of the tale, of course, centers round the plight of the migratory worker. I am convinced, however, that the message of the book relates itself to a much wider plane and that unless we read it from this broader perspective, its meaning may be lost. While the immediate setting is California its real setting is our modern world, and while its immediate problem is the migratory worker its real problem is found in those underlying trends and ideas which are molding our so-called civilization. In these, religion and the church have a stake and I, for one, share the conviction, that unless the leaders of organized religion take the initiative in calling attention to these trends and ideas, the Church will not only betray its high mission but will go down in the debacle which will inevitably overtake our present order of society.

For instance, the twenty-fifth chapter of *Grapes of Wrath* ought to be read and re-read by every person in the United States until its implications are woven into the very structure of the mind. Steinbeck reveals the providence and the fertility of nature even as he causes us to realize the inventive and productive genius of man. But he also shows how this providence of nature and this productive genius of man are nullified by inhuman greed. How biting his indictment!—

> Men who can graft the trees and make the seed fertile and big can find no way to let the hungry people eat their produce. Men who have created new fruits in the world cannot create a system whereby their fruits may be eaten. . . . The works of the roots of the vines, of the trees, must be destroyed to keep up the price, and this is the saddest, bitterest thing of all.

What is involved here goes to the very foundations of our civilization. Here, ultimately, are the roots of modern war, class struggle and revolution! If our social structure is finally destroyed, the future historian will find in this the cause.

Once more, *Grapes of Wrath* drives home the truth, which our society has not yet learned, that the science of economics in its fundamental nature is, primarily, not a materialistic science. It is fundamentally a spiritual science—or if you prefer another term, a "psychological science"—since it deals with the wants and satisfactions of the whole man. For instance, the economist, even as the industrialist, speaks of "labor costs" and these are measured in dollars and cents, in shillings and pounds, in rubles, guilders, and yen. Thus labor becomes a commodity to be bought and sold in the market place like any other commodity. Therefore the cry—and it has dominated all our industry in the past—"Keep down the labor cost, keep down the labor cost!" And in the words of the author of *Factories in the Field* as he relates all this to farm labor and the migratory worker—"Any labor will do, provided only that it is cheap and docile." No wonder that the laborers seek to organize! And let me say this—despite all the abuses of which organized labor may be guilty, and I am familiar with them even as I deplore them—generally speaking the workers in every country on the globe, with few exceptions, have always been exploited, except insofar as they have been able to protect themselves by organization. Here again, the mission of religion is unmistakably clear. It must shout aloud from the housetops until the conscience of the world awakens, that economics and social morality cannot be divorced, and that labor costs can only be

measured in terms of life—in terms of home and family, of women and children, of laughter and love, of friendship and sympathy, of security for both body and mind.

In conclusion, let me deal with one criticism which has been levelled against the book. It has been said that with the exception of "Ma" its leading characters are degenerate. In a measure this is true. However, the degeneracy is not the fruit of the native stock, but the result of the grinding struggle with poverty against impossible odds. The moral dice were loaded against the Joad family and they were beaten. Their souls were bruised and crushed by life.

Nevertheless, as I studied these characters my spirit sang for joy, for I realized as I had never done before, that even the most adverse circumstances cannot totally destroy the divine spark within the soul of man. Despite the depths to which they had descended, the members of the Joad family still aspired to nobleness. The spirit of adventure was there. The hunger for beauty was there. The fine sense of independence —which is the backbone of American character—was there. All they asked—each one of them—was the chance to labor and to enjoy the fruits of their toil. They sought security, to be sure, but only that they might be decent and self-respecting as they partook of life's simple joys. But even as my spirit sang for joy, I heard an agonizing cry, a cry that wrung my heart and which will haunt me all my days, the cry of the dispossessed!—the cry of the men and women and little children everywhere, who—through no fault of their own—are denied access to the tree of life. Unless the world heeds this cry, it will drink the bitter and poisonous vintage of the grapes of wrath.

Yet I do not believe that the cry will go unheeded. The fact that books, such as the one we have been considering, are reaching an ever-widening circle and that the questions they raise are increasingly discussed, is a sign of the times. I submit that it is a hopeful sign. Despite the evils that abound and the wrongs that are so strongly entrenched, the better spirit of mankind is awakening. And according to an ancient story, when the waters are troubled the time of healing is at hand.

Why I Can Have No Part in War

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW*

The World War began just as I was entering the ministry. At once I found myself confronted with the dilemma of squaring my ordination vows with the attitude the churches were taking toward Germany in particular and war in general. During the months that followed there was deep searching of heart, out of which was born the conviction that war was the complete denial of everything I held as moral, and therefore something of which I could have no part. I began to regard the church as a mother who had prostituted both her soul and body, and so I left her as an unfaithful mother, assured that she had betrayed both her children and her obligation.

After the big war and the little peace I began to feel that even though the war had been wrong, perhaps some good might be accomplished through the League of Nations, and so I gave my time and energy to this end, hoping that America might lead the way. Little did I realize then that it is impossible to do evil that good might issue therefrom. The flow of years has shown me how futile was this hope. Yes, it might have had different results; but the fact remains, war which must be fought at the behest of hate, revenge, and lust, could have but one possible result—which is more war.

The intervening years with their growing insights and mature judgments have deepened my convictions, so that today I regard war as the one collective sin of which all mankind is guilty. There is nothing worse than war when it is judged by all the consequences, benevolent and malevolent, which issue from it. From it all the other evils follow as disease follows from a polluted spring. We are told that wars are fought to vindicate principles of justice, liberty, and the right to self-determination. Out of war thus fought peace is supposed to issue, which of course means justice, liberty, and right. What actually happens is a peace which is dictated by the victor, not with a view of doing justice to the foe but to the victorious. Such a peace results in creating more injustice, more ill liberty, and more ill will. These in turn become the causes for future wars to be fought to insure justice, etc., and so the vicious cycle goes on forever. Thus the plain fact is that war settles no wrongs, vindicates no rights, and establishes no justice.

In discussing war, all analogies, such as the necessity of stopping a madman at large in the community, the robber entering one's house, and the bandits terrorizing a city, are utterly inapplicable. It is not a matter of restraint versus no restraint, not law and order versus anarchy. A policeman and all the peace officers are not in the remotest way equivalent to nations declaring war. We do attempt to give a highwayman impartial justice, which is something a victorious nation has no idea of doing.

The question whether war is justifiable at one time and not at another is not an academic question at all. It does not fall into the same category of the white lie and black lie. Nor does it fit into the classification of murder—willful or for self-protection. War for most people is not a moral matter at all, but purely the choice of an expedient as a method to obtain a desired result. And so long as war remains in this category there will always be found justifiable excuses to use it as a method, and no amount of collective restraint will deter its use.

In all other matters, society has long since learned that whatever act or intent in its total consequences is disastrous to the well-being of all, by virtue of that becomes bad and therefore wrong. When war is thus viewed in the light of its total consequences, there is but one verdict possible, and no recital of temporary or idealistic gain can justify it.

It is therefore evident that the end does not justify the means, however idealistic the end may be; for in the final analysis, if the means be totally disastrous they by that token make the end immoral. To argue that there is something worse than war, and that is an unwillingness to fight for right, justice, liberty, is to forget that these non-material entities cannot be

*Mr. Argow is minister of the May Memorial Church (Unitarian), Syracuse, N. Y.

vindicated by the material means of tanks, cannons, and airplanes. The only way to destroy the ideologies of the Germans and Russians is to annihilate every last person who cherishes them; and when you do so you discover that the ideology has escaped and infected millions of others. A military defeat of Hitler will not result in destroying either Hitlerism or the conditions that made Hitler. It is only as the causes that led to war are changed that genuine peace is possible.

At bottom, men are moral creatures, all things to the contrary notwithstanding. Which means that moral motives are the primary motivations of men, collectively and individually. This being so, then the only effective method which can be used to change human behavior is through reliance upon those basic forces that make us what we are. In the long last, men will respond to justice, honesty, right, liberty. The cost to bring this about may be dear from a material and physically comfortable point of view; but the cost not to do so will be the final destruction of man himself.

Men always act according to what they believe to be the fundamental nature of the universe. If they believe that right, justice, truth, liberty are merely the result of what the majority has agreed upon—whether through the mores, or contemporary group action—instead of a part of the ultimate nature of Reality, then alas they will feel themselves under obligation to make war for the right, for justice, for truth. It is impossible for them to believe that Right will fight for them! That Justice will fight for them! That Truth will fight for them! They speak of right as Emerson did of God. "Poor God with no one to pity him." Poor right with no one to fight for it! If the only right there is in this world is the consensus of opinion that exists in man's arguments, then indeed is there no vitality, no power within it to preserve itself. To assume this, is to insist that the only gravitation this world possesses is the small amount registered in the scientific instruments used to measure it. Why not start a war to preserve the integrity and to vindicate the multiplication table, or the truth of magnetic attraction!

If this attitude be fatalism, at least it has the quality of being moral. Surely it is no less fatalistic than to believe that the destiny of man is dependent upon mental states which the brain secretes as right, as his liver secretes bile.

The depth of immorality is to assume that we live in a universe in which the final way to vindicate good is through evil! That forthwith makes evil the ultimate arbiter, the last resort upon which man must stake his conscience. It means the complete denial of all that the moral sense in man has stood for.

Thus the question of war of defense, and wars of aggression, wars for the protection against aggressors, war for idealistic ends of vindicating rights and liberties—destroying more than they preserve. Man must get rid of war, or war will get rid of man. It so happens that we live in a universe which will not permit us to do evil that good may come from the evil we do. There is a law of consequence whose other name is God.

The Time for Love Has Come

The time for love has come!
The hour for the doing away with hoof and claw,
With tooth and fang and snout,
With bomb and gun and battleships and hell.
The fiery dragon must be put to rout,
Humanity be wakened from the spell
Of brutal centuries. For shame! For shame!
To tolerate this crime, too black to name,
To urge our sons with sound of battle drum
To murder one another—
Friend against friend, brother against brother—
The time for love has come!

The time for love has come!
The time for love and the going away from greed.
That man who says: "*My* church, *my* faith, *my* creed
Are Truth and Truth alone; all else is naught"—
Nor knows all men, all Truth, all creeds as one—
Is sinning against the Father and the Son.
He is a sinner, blacker than the lost
Who hugs a selfish Credo at the cost
Of peace upon the earth,
Good will to men.
Let time and Truth and justice smite him dumb—
The time for love has come!

The time for love has come—
The hour for the casting away of spite and malice,
Of bitter "mine and thine."
The world must quaff a deeply poisoned chalice
Unless man's brew of hate is turned to wine—
The wine of understanding and of peace.
Earth's tortured multitudes must know release,
Be lifted from the mire to breathe the morning,
No need for hatreds and no need for scorning—
Forever gone the crime of trench and slum—
The time for LOVE has come!

The time for love is here!
The Hour for love and the birth of a new race.
War's dark and fierce dominion grows apace—
Its roots lie deep within the rotting ground,
The unrelinquished past, unkind, uncouth.
Our precious rituals are all outworn
In this black moment of a planet torn
By conflicts terrible and fears profound,
By desperate exploitation
Of our youth.
The Hour has come for the casting away of fear—
The time for LOVE is here!

The time for love has come—
The time for love and the putting away of pride.
Along the roads where brutal armies ride
Emerge the dazzling hosts, with banners flung,
Of a new Kingdom and an unheard tongue.
The battlefronts of heaven are flashing white
With armies now in vigorous formation.
All who believe in spiritual power
Join hands, join wills, nor ask what creed or clan,
ONE WORD FOR ALL: THE FELLOWSHIP OF MAN.
For, hark the fife! And hark the rolling drum—
The time for LOVE has come!

ANGELA MORGAN.

Indian Freedom and British War Aims*

TARAKNATH DAS

What is happening in India is nothing but a phase of the Indian people's struggle for freedom from British rule. After more than 150 years of British rule, the people of India today do not enjoy even the same kind of limited independence which the people of the Philippines do under the American rule. British authorities have promised that India will have dominion status; but they refuse to set a date for the attainment of this objective and refuse to allow the Indian people the right to frame their own constitution.

In March, 1939, the All India National Congress, in its annual session held at Tripuri adopted resolutions denouncing Fascism and Naziism and the foreign policy of Britain, which lent support to Fascist Italy, Nazi Germany, and imperialist Japan, and demanded control of India's foreign affairs and national defense which are denied by the so-called constitution of India, known as the Government of India Act of 1935.

Early in August, 1939, Lord Linlithgow, the Viceroy of India, ignoring India's national demands and without consulting the Indian Legislative Assembly, dispatched troops from India to Singapore, Aden, Egypt, and other points of international tension. Furthermore, just after Great Britain declared war against Germany, the Viceroy of India made a declaration of war without consulting the Indian Legislative Assembly and also adopted severe restrictive measures which destroyed the last vestige of freedom for provincial governments. After these things happened, the Working Committee of the All India National Congress took the stand that unless India was allowed that independence for which the National Congress, since its foundation in 1885, had been striving, the British Government should not expect India to coöperate wholeheartedly in the prosecution of the war. Mahatma Gandhi and all the responsible Indian nationalist leaders have repeatedly made it clear that India is willing to fight on the side of Britain, for the cause of freedom, but she demands her own freedom which Britain has usurped.

In reply to India's demands, the Viceroy, on the 17th of October stated that the British Government, during the period of the war, would not even consider any discussion leading to India's attainment of dominion status at any definite date. As a result of this refusal, political non-coöperation has already begun in eight provinces. There the Congress Party Ministers have resigned their posts. Now India is ruled virtually through dictatorial power of the Governors and the Viceroy. Unless a satisfactory solution of the present conflict between the British Government and the All India National Congress is found, Mahatma Gandhi may take the momentous step of inaugurating civil disobedience which would lead to paralysis of the government. To justify the stand of the British Government, Lord Zetland, the Secretary of State for India in the present government, has recently declared that for England to agree to the demands of the All India National Congress would mean a breach of promise made by the British to the Indian Princes, and betrayal of the rights of minorities like the Moslem communities of India. Also, he maintained, that as a result of the inability of the Indian people to defend their country, India would be open to foreign invasion. Let us examine the validity of the official statements.

In the past, British Governments have dethroned Indian Princes and taken over the administration of the States on grounds satisfactory only to themselves. The Indian Princes do not enjoy sovereign rights, and the concession of dominion status and the democratization of the government of the States ruled by Princes could not constitute a breach of promise.

The British have always used the argument of Hindu-Moslem disunity as a pretext for denying the right to freedom to the Indian people. Lord Snell in the course of India debate in the House of Lords, very rightly pointed out that because of the existence of the same vital interests for both communities, there are greater elements of unity than disunity among the enlightened Indians of both religions. There are millions of Moslems in India who are nationalists; and during the non-coöperation movement, more than 25,000 Moslems went to jail for supporting the National Congress program for Indian freedom. Today Moslem nationalists are coöperating with Hindu and Christian nationalists of India; and the best example of this is the fact that in the Northwestern frontier province, where 90 per cent or more of the population are Moslems, is one of the strongholds of the Congress Party and Indian Independence Movement. There are communalist Moslems led by pan-Islamist politicians, belonging to the All India Moslem League. These anti-democratic politicians are opposed to the Congress Party because they are afraid of losing their positions which are secured through religious bigotry and consideration from British authorities. Furthermore, the Moslem minority of India comprises a little more than one-fifth of the total population; and only a section of this minority, which is more interested in Arab freedom than Indian freedom, ought not to stand in the way of freedom for India.

The question of Indian national defense is of vital importance to the cause of Indian freedom. (Indeed, every Indian patriot is conscious of the fact that without adequate national defense, the fate of India might be the same as that of Ethiopia, of China, of Czechoslovakia, of Poland.) During the last fifty years the National Congress has been advocating measures that would enable the Indian people to assume full responsibility for national defense. But the British policy has been to disarm the nation and deprive the people of even the most fundamental facilities for military training. As a result, although India during the last seventy years has spent more money for military expenditure than Japan has for both naval and military purposes, India virtually has no navy. An Indian army without British officers and British forces cannot defend the country. Today there is no adequate provision for training Indian officers in India. Indians are not even allowed to enter the Indian Air Force or the mechanized and chemical warfare divisions. The present position of defenselessness of India is a result of deliberate British policy. Let there be no mistake about it that, with proper training, Indians are just as capable of defending their country as are the Japanese or the Turks or the Russians. With proper utilization of India's man power, wealth of raw materials, and strategic position, under expert direction, India can develop within a few years a military machine no less formidable than that of Soviet Russia. Nationalist India, with or without the coöpera-

*Text of a radio broadcast over WQXR, New York, December 5, 1939.—*Editor.*

tion of Britain, will develop a national defense force which will be effective for Indian national security. However, it should not be forgotten that none of the British Dominions is able to defend itself without British aid; and yet the British have allowed them full dominion status. Why should there be one standard for India and another for the Dominions? Is it because of Britain's racial imperialism, based upon anti-Asianism?

In conclusion, I wish to emphasize that although the present rulers of Britain—particularly Sir John Simon, Mr. Winston Churchill and others—are championing freedom for the Poles, Czechs and others, they are not even in favor of promising, far from granting, dominion status for India. Under these circumstances, are the British statesmen honest in their professions of desiring human liberty and equality for all peoples, while keeping 350,000,000 people in India under subjection? Future developments in the struggle for Indian freedom will give the real answer to these questions.

If the present war continues for a long time and the British refuse to consider the National Congress demands favorably, Mahatma Gandhi and others may be forced to fall back on civil disobedience—which might lead to a national revolt; and this may be supported by outside anti-British forces. It may be suggested that a revolt can be ruthlessly suppressed by British military forces as was recently done by the Germans in Czechoslovakia. But such suppression of freedom will not crush the national movement for all time; on the contrary, it would make Indo-British friendship and coöperation impossible. A free India may voluntarily serve as the most valuable ally of Britain. An enslaved India, on the other hand, would be a constant menace to Britain and may become a factor in hastening the destruction of the British Empire. The future rests with British statesmanship.

On the Pacifist Front

[UNITY will publish from time to time, under this heading, such news as can be gathered about pacifists and pacifist activities in these war days. We earnestly invite our readers to send us such items of interest as may come to their attention.—*Editor.*]

VIII

Gandhi has made his position toward the European War perfectly clear in a striking article in the January 13th issue of *Liberty*. He believes in absolute pacifism more firmly than ever:

> My personal reaction to this war is one of greater horror than ever before. This greater horror would prevent me today from becoming the self-appointed recruiting sergeant that I became during the last war.

Stating that his sympathies are nonetheless "wholly with the Allies," the Mahatma adds that he has "no ready-made concrete plan for opposing or ending this war." But, he continues:

> I have no choice as to the means. The means must always be non-violent. . . Assuming that God had endowed me with full powers (which He never does), I would at once ask the English to lay down their arms, free all their vassals . . . and defy all the totalitarians of the world to do their worst. Englishmen would then die unresistingly, and they would go down in history as heroes of non-violence.

The *News Bulletin* of the Committee on Militarism in Education publishes the following:

> *California Students Fight Drill Compulsion.* Once again students at the University of California are campaigning for the end of compulsory military drill. This time their cause is buttressed by the findings of an impressive report published under the auspices of a peace sub-committee of the student government body. Prepared by Morris D. Glickfeld, the ninety-one page report is an excellent discussion of every phase—legal, educational and military—of the R. O. T. C. problem as it prevails at the University of California, both in the Berkeley and Los Angeles branches. Limitations of space forbid adequate description of the contents of the student report. However, the three recommendations advanced in the report may be indicated. They are: (1) That the compulsory enrollment feature of the R. O. T. C. be abolished, and that the training be placed on a purely voluntary basis; (2) That a peace education course be established and made available to all university undergraduates; and (3) That the university's intramural athletic program be expanded in order that larger numbers of students may be able to participate in it.

The following are words recently spoken in commemoration of certain Doukhobor leaders:

> Once again we stand at this strange place—the tomb of our two leaders, father and son. As we stop to cast our attention over the years through which these two great characters have guided us, we begin to realize that many of their noble endeavors have come prophetically true. Both belonged to the race of those men who march in life alone.
>
> Doukhobor Youth, we appeal to you in the name of Christ and all other righteous workers of truth. It is high time for us to realize that we are standing at the most critical period of the world's existence. I venture to raise my voice amidst this dark and gripping reality, for with the bit of penetrating insight that I possess, it is evident to me that, unless you awaken yourselves to the onrushing dangers, and be masters of your destiny, the dark forces will forever engulf you and will force you to follow the destructive path into which the human race has been seduced once again.
>
> Our fathers, with the guidance of this one truly noble soul lying here—Peter Vaselvitch Verigin—challenged this mad world in 1895, when they burned their firearms.
>
> This protest of 1895 against the world's militarism and murder of one people against another is one of the most significant events in the annals of mankind. As we stand today facing the same old world-monster, called war, we are amazed to the deepest depths of our being: why should one man develop all his ingenious possibilities in the extermination of another? There is no justification for this, no matter from what point we may undertake to investigate it.
>
> Doukhobor Youth, you must remember that there is no escape from eternal obligation. You will be guilty of highest treason against the workers of truth in all ages if you silence your voices. We must challenge this world-beast as our fathers did. For it is our sacred duty to cry to the peoples of the world with the words of that Divine Master whose echoes are still discernible from the depths of ages: *"All they that take the sword shall perish with the sword."*
>
> We have entered an age in which mankind must achieve unity or it will perish. The human race, since the last world war, has had wonderful opportunities to rebuild its life on peaceful foundations. But it has failed, and this opportunity has passed never to return.
>
> Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he reap—this is still the true measurement of our endeavors. "Thou shalt not kill" is the only vital foundation of life, the sole path to man's salvation. All other methods, irrespective of their many logical promises, are deceitful and disastrous.
>
> May God help us all to seek the real truth, that we may all attain perfection and self-mastery!

The New York *Times* publishes the following dispatch from Edinburgh, Scotland:

> When Sir John Anderson, Home Secretary, came to Edin-

burgh to urge the people to start a new war effort he received many telegrams from women demanding peace.

While he was addressing a city corporation luncheon the telegrams started arriving at his table. They came from across the city, where a meeting of the Scottish Women's Peace Movement was going on. Each one said: "Urgent. Women in Edinburgh want peace."

Sir John interrupted his speech to refer to the appeal, which he said was either "mischievous or rather pathetic."

The English monthly, *War Commentary,* publishes the following in its December issue:

There is a growing anti-war feeling on the industrial front. One need look no further than the plain fact that increasing numbers of trades councils, local unions, co-ops and other sections of the labor movement are passing resolutions condemning the war as a war of rival imperialisms, despite the efforts of the leadership to pooh-pooh such talk.

Now we want to see genuine anti-war feeling: which we differentiate from the opportunism of the Communists and the Fascists. They are not anti-war, but pro-the-other-side. They do not believe the war to be one between rival imperialisms: but one of capitalist imperialist Western Allies against the "dynamic socialism" of Germany and Russia.

One might as well call Chamberlain pro-peace—because he wants Hitler to stop—or Hitler pro-peace—because he wants Chamberlain to stop!

For genuine anti-war feeling one must look elsewhere. There are people—no inconsiderable number—who are either opposed to all wars, as pacifists, or to all capitalist wars, as Socialists.

There is still plenty of genuine Socialism in the organized labor movement, even if seldom articulate. . . The rise of the No Conscription League is significant in this connection. Important sections of the labor movement are allying themselves to this definitely anti-war organization. It is a new trend, and a trend in the right direction, for labor's rank and file. Without a doubt, the working class movement is waking up to opposing the capitalist war now it has come.

An analysis of the anti-war resolutions of working class gatherings is interesting. One of the principal ideas is for a "conference of Governments," "immediate armistice," "declare peace now"; in the influential journal, *Forward,* it was actually suggested that King George should come to the microphone announcing peace—"Yes, now!"—and Chamberlain, Daladier and Hitler should "talk it over!" . . .

Again the capitalists have forced us into war; no action, nothing more than telegrams and hopes that the leopard will change his spots. The bastions have fallen in Spain; they are falling here, and Chamberlain, be he flooded with telegrams, won't help to rebuild them. Nor would a conference (even if including imperialist Russia, as the Communists want) be of the slightest use; capitalist wars will continue just as long as capitalism lasts.

A useful trend in the No Conscription League is the importance being insisted on by many upon industrial action; upon the defense of wages, and the gaining of conditions; upon the strikes and work shop committees that will arise.

The Community Church of New York at its annual meeting on January 8, 1940, adopted the following resolutions:

In obedience to the principle of sanctity of conscience, which is central to all religious faith, the Community Church of New York herewith announces its recognition of the right of conscientious objection to war.

This Church further announces its intention, should the United States go to war, to uphold the right of those among its people who, in sincerity and truth, may refuse to participate in war. The Church to the utmost of its endeavor will respect the views of these conscientious objectors, and seek for them every protection under the law.

The Minister will register conscientious objectors among the members of the Church.

The spirit of armed conflict is inconsistent with the attitude of love toward all mankind, which it is the conscientious duty of every Church to maintain with fidelity and vigor. Therefore, the Community Church, an institution of religion, dedicated to the service of humanity, in pursuance of the high ideals of its faith and regarding the injection of wartime propaganda into its services of worship as an intrusion upon its spiritual purposes, counsels its Minister to keep absent from its religious services all petitions, summonses, appeals and speeches of any sort whatsoever, and upon any occasion, which may foster the spirit of war, therewith serving to weaken its bonds of fellowship with all peoples of the earth regardless of sect, class, nation, or race.

The New York papers have published the following announcement:

Conscientious objectors to war were upheld recently by the executive board of the United Lutheran Church in America, in closed session at the National Lutheran Council's headquarters, 39 East Thirty-fifth Street, New York City. The stand taken is the first on record for this Lutheran body. It was announced as official and needing no further ratification.

The board expressed a conviction that "the conscience of the individual, informed and inspired by the Word of God, is the final authority in determining conduct," but went on to explain that such a position by the board was not necessarily to be taken to "imply the church's approval of such conscientious objection but does proclaim its devotion and respect for the scriptural principle of the supreme moral responsibility of the individual conscience."

Continuing, the statement said: "As the exponent and defender of Christian principle, the church must respect and safeguard the Christian in his right to the honest exercise" of the responsibility of the individual conscience. "Abuse of the principle by hypocrites using conscience as a cloak for cowardice," was singled out as a challenge "to special care in judging the spirit and motives of those who may call upon the church for safeguarding in such a position."

The statement ended with emphasis upon the Christian's "duty to be loyal in support and service to the nation whose protection and benefits he enjoys."

The Field

(*Continued from page* 166)

against the chain-gang system, controlled by the overlords of egotism. I have no wish to kill, to injure, or to ignore anguish. I follow afar in the paths of those who gave their lives that pain might be no more.

I am a pacifist!

I bear witness to the enthralling adventures of peace, and lay claim to the illimitable opportunities of peace.

I understand that, as a conscientious objector, I automatically become one of the casualties of war, and I do not ask for preferential treatment. I am loyal to my faith. I sense that my sufferings will not have been in vain, but that they will have contributed to the ending of war as a system, to the salvaging of democracy's priceless boon of freedom and to the maintenance of religion as a common platform for the expression of the highest in man.

Consequently, I am not discouraged.

I look to the end. I hold to the path. I walk step by step.

I am a pacifist!

My first duty is to believe in the good will of others.

I will not curse the dictator, lest I myself become a dictator.

I will not focus my thoughts on his abnormal characteristics, lest I myself become abnormal.

I will not banish him beyond the limits of my tolerance, lest I myself become an exile.

I assert that the implements of war create minds of war. I see with my own eyes that fear, prejudice, and untruth are spreading far and wide. I do not intend to yield to these forces, but, with all my mental and moral energy, strive to surmount them. Thus, I attain a plane above the smoke of battle, where I am able to see beyond the horizons of this generation and can penetrate in the World of Tomorrow.

I am a pacifist!

I constitute myself the guardian of the principle that every man and woman should be free to follow his or her conscience; and I insist that there are some things that the state cannot control. Here, I stake my life on the conviction that there is a more perfect law than the law of the land and a higher court than the court of last appeal; and I share in the opinion that, in the forum of conscience, duty to a moral law must be maintained—the state of notwithstanding. I believe that the essence of religion is belief in a relation to God, and

(*Continued on page* 180)

The Study Table

Lester Ward: "Meliorist"

LESTER F. WARD. *By Samuel Chugerman.* 591 *pp. Durham, N. C.: Duke University Press.* $5.00.

The task of condensing into the compass of a normal review even a most cursory examination of the contents of a massive volume of almost 600 pages, replete with wisdom upon all the aspects of what is comprehensively known as sociology, is an herculean one. Moreover, the erudition of Samuel Chugerman of Duke University deserves a more adequate presentation of his triumph in effecting a picture in such dimension, and in doing it with charm and complete absence of pedantry.

In a recent editorial in a popular magazine the writer says:—"You may not know it, but at heart you are either an Aristotelian or a Platonist."

Mr. Chugerman describes Lester Ward as the American Aristotle, and if the range of his philosophical contemplation is the touchstone the appellation is apt.

Stephen Duggan has just said in another editorial, "The writer of this editorial has always been and is now a meliorist." Lester Ward sums up the philosophy of the meliorist thus: "Optimism may be said to be the thesis, pessimism, the antithesis, and meliorism the synthesis of man's relation to the universe. The optimist says: do nothing because there is nothing to do. The pessimist says: do nothing because nothing can be done. The meliorist says: do something, because there is much to do, and it can be done."

That this definition of meliorism was presented almost a century ago by Ward, as one of the pioneers in American sociology, is remarkable, and its applicability to the situation of the moment no less remarkable. Accepting the definition your reviewer would avow his own "meliorism" as a complement to liberalism versus radicalism.

It has been suggested that the contribution of Lester Ward to modern sociology is almost negative, but such a judgment overlooks the fact that he was a pioneer in the field, and the result of the work of no pioneer in any field of human knowledge is negligible.

In a calm and dispassionate foreword to the present volume, Professors Ellwood and Jensen dispose of this objection by summarizing under three very definite heads the affirmative contributions made by Ward, to wit: The emphasis which Ward placed upon psychic factors in interhuman relations, his emphasis upon human achievement as the proper subject matter for sociology, and in the third place his passionate affirmation of the possibility of intelligent social progress or of the future improvement of human society, through the development of sociological science.

In the last four decades the insistence upon all three of these aspects of sociology gives emphasis to the import of the pioneering, and even if the momentary status of human society tends to give aid and comfort to the pessimist rather than to the meliorist, the fundamental issues remain unchanged.

The aid given by science to the "barbaric" in man has not changed his basic nature, and despite death-dealing instruments galore there are not wanting signs of an "ethical consciousness" held in abeyance for pragmatic reasons but which the religionist may still describe as the "still small voice" that is unquiet and troubled before the recrudescence of savagery.

It is utterly impossible to summarize this book and it would be of small avail to make the attempt. The chief contribution of a review of this kind should be to emphasize its import not only for the professional sociologists as a rich mine of original material but for the thinking layman interested in the storied past as an open sesame to source material.

Albeit, this is the object of this review, and your reviewer makes bold therefore to select for discussion two or three issues which particularly appeal to him for timeliness, whereas another reviewer might choose entirely different aspects of a volume that encompasses almost every subject of human speculation.

The biographical chapter is interesting as exemplification of the value of wide experience as apart from multifarious book learning, and this is of course far more important for the laborer in the vineyard of the humanities than for the specialist in the exact sciences.

Mr. Chugerman's summarization is worth quotation in that it may apply with equal validity to many another, as it so aptly sums up Ward. "Uncompromising and far ahead of his colleagues, he refused to indulge in gracious suavities or in the gentle art of tempering his scientific conclusions with theological compromises. His lack of plasticity was pure integrity. He was not born a pathological genius, or had genius thrust upon him, but his life was a steady growth, an application of talents which ripened into genius. His tastes were simple, though not circumscribed. Light literature was neither light nor literature to him. . . . Both as a man and as a teacher of men, Ward had his faults. Who has not? Perhaps he was too pontifical and uncompromising, as some of his friends suggested. How could he help it, alone as he was in a new and vast field of science, lifting those below and around him to his shoulders to show them the path and the goal? His gigantic intellect does not always appear symmetrically perfect to smaller minds. But we need not accept him as a superman, and it would be as unjust to sanctify him as to ignore him."

Ward was a prolific writer and no bibliography is here attempted. Suffice it to mention these outstanding books: *Dynamic Sociology, The Psychic Factors of Civilization, Outlines of Sociology, Pure Sociology,* and *Applied Sociology.*

Pure Sociology shows a transition from Ward's earlier naturalistic view of society to an almost completely cultural view and it should be noted that this disputation is by no means determined at this much later date. The chapter upon religion is a provocative one and Mr. Chugerman's own terminology affords as good a picture as can be desired. "Whether the purified form of the religious sentiment in the new society will flourish, as Ward predicted, or whether it will be absorbed by science or reappear under a different name, is in the lap of the future. Meanwhile, sociology stands for the principle that too little science, and too little religiosity, not too much, will enslave us. The fear that science, too, is a dogma accepted on faith, should not impede our search for truth as it has done to so many pure philosophers and scientific metaphysicians. The hope of the brave traveler through knowledge lies not in the continuation of superstition or the attainment of a peaceful state of inertia but in the continued conquest by reason of which both religion and

science are products of evermore unexplored fields, especially those of mind and society, in the interest of human happiness."

There is an illuminating chapter upon the place of woman in human society and it evidences again the pioneering mind which was Ward's. Let Mr. Chugerman again sum up: "The truth will never recede before the superficial and the apparent. Ward surveyed the mountain of facts concerning sex, and opened the world's eyes to new vistas lying beyond male prejudice and sex dogma. The genius of initiating the new view of womanhood belongs to him. For that alone, many would place his name beside Darwin and Spencer in Biology, and Freud and Ellis in Sexology."

The discussion which interests the present reviewer vitally is that termed: "Education, the Great Panacea." Ward's plea was an eloquent statement of the idea that a system of education, to be worthy of the name, must be framed for the great proletariat. Mr. Chugerman says: "To the criticism that education would be wasted and impossible for the submerged classes, he patiently repeats that it is they who are the salt of the earth and who will finally inherit it. The roar of dissatisfaction which we hear around the world is the subterranean rumbling of the masses. And because genius is latent in its lowest depths, Ward pins his hope for social progress upon the unthinking and unwashed swarm whose day is dawning. His concern for the meek of the earth swells through his eloquent periods." And then quotes Ward himself thus: "The denizens of the slums are the same kind of people as the inhabitants of the most respectable quarters. They are not fools by any means, but men and women with normal minds, susceptible, if surrounded by the same influences, of becoming as capable and intelligent people as any. As to the criminals, they are the geniuses of the slums. Society has forced them into this field and they are making the best use they can of their native abilities. Punishment does not reform and make good citizens of them. They go back with more bitter hatred of society than before, and they finally justify their attacks upon it, realizing that it is responsible for their condition."

There is in the whole philosophy of Ward a plea for a synthesis between the pragmatic vocational concept and the purely cultural ideal of the late President Faunce and of the present President Robert M. Hutchins of the University of Chicago. Maybe in the "synthesis" lies the ultimate solution for American educational idealism in the tomorrow?

The philosophy of meliorism is aptly stated in the following statement: "The scientific optimism that permeates meliorism cannot tolerate or move in any paths of laissez-faire. In the face of man's power over nature, including his own lot, the individualist philosophy stands utterly bankrupt. The meliorist is surprised to see man slumbering peacefully amid the ruins of his failures, or else fighting desperately for mere existence, wretched and naked, in a world of wealth and beauty. In such a social arena, what room is there for any philosophy of "mind your own business" or "there is nothing to be done about it." Both the philosophies of competition and inaction in a world of dynamic human beings are anomalies.

The epilogue to this evaluation of Ward's life and contributions to the fundamentals of sociology deserves to be quoted in full but one brief passage must suffice: "Aristotle found form more important than substance; Comte, method ahead of doctrine. Ward pointed out the synthesis of popular necessities and philosophical tendencies, according to which the true social point of view will gradually prevail in proportion as the active interest of the people begins to analyze and solve the grand social problems. With science at hand, men will be able for the first time in history to lay their own road into the future, and walk together, secure in the knowledge that human life through concerted action will come to mean more than a paradise for a few and an inferno for the rest."

"You may not know it, but at heart you are either an Aristotelian or a Platonist" is absolutely demonstrated by this volume for no reader can leave it without a profound self-examination and a compulsion to define his or her philosophical and sociological position.

Every earnest student, professional or lay, is indebted to the savant of today, Samuel Chugerman, for his brilliant exposition of the ideas and ideals of the savant of yesterday, Lester F. Ward.

EMANUEL STERNHEIM.

Development of Philosophical Thought

PHILOSOPHY IN AMERICA. *By Paul Ressell Anderson and Max Harold Fisch. 570 pp. New York: D. Appleton-Century Company.* $4.00.

This is a welcome book. It is one in the Century Philosophy Series edited by Professor Lamprecht of Amherst. The editor is to be congratulated on insisting that American thought be recognized. Not until after the first instalment of the World War did Europe admit that America had produced either a literature or a philosophy. Now American history, literature, and philosophy are being studied as a distinct contribution to a common cause. This book emphasizes the fact that there has been in the United States a development of philosophical thought. Early documents hitherto available only to certain scholars are here discussed and given ready appraisal. The work is divided into four sections: colonial, the age of reason, transcendentalism and evolution, and the emergence of contemporary issues. A fine discrimination has been used in selection. It is good to see included John Woolman, Thomas Jefferson and Thomas Cooper, Emerson and William Torrey Harris. The last named has been acclaimed by no less an authority than Nicholas Murray Butler as "the one truly great philosophical mind which has yet appeared on the western continent." It is high time that a biography of Harris be written. Harris humanized the great Hegel and taught Americans to appreciate him, but he did more than that. He founded and edited the *Journal of Speculative Philosophy,* the first philosophical journal in the English language. He formulated a philosophy of education; he taught America to appreciate Plato and the Greeks; he presided over that interesting and little known St. Louis School of thought and helped promote the Concord School of Philosophy. All in all Harris was the apostle of philosophy and education to the Middle West. It is just beginning to dawn on the American consciousness that the Middle West was in many ways the teacher who found solutions for many difficulties and problems. The discussion of the forgotten Harris is worth the price of the book.

CHARLES A. HAWLEY.

Correspondence

Our Defense Needs

Editor of UNITY:

After expending some seven billion dollars under the present administration for national defense it is startling to have a high army official tell us that our defense preparations are only 25 per cent adequate. Congress is expected to add some $300,000,000 to the $1,800,000,000 appropriated at the last session for army and navy expenditures during the current biennium. Meanwhile funds for WPA and other public work projects, for farm aid, for the CCC camps, and for many educational and social betterment programs are being curtailed in the name of economy.

We all want adequate preparation for defense. But our needs for that purpose depend in a considerable degree upon our national policies. We will do well to ask whether our militarists in and outside of Congress are taking advantage of the war scare to demand larger and still larger appropriations without reference to policies. As for President Roosevelt, may it be that in spite of apparent devotion to the cause of peace, he has inherited something of the Theodore Roosevelt obsession for a grand navy?

What prospective foes have we that we should need such astonishing expenditures for defense? So far as one can see, there is less likelihood of our being attacked now than there has been for many years. The great powers have their attention and hands occupied with wars and threat of more wars nearer home. When these wars are ended the nations are almost certain to be too exhausted to be a menace to us. Oswald Garrison Villard quotes a high British army official as saying it is preposterous to suppose that any other nation would dare attack us.

If we decided to change our neutrality policy to the extent of giving some aid to the Chinese, we could do so effectively by refusing to sell Japan the war supplies for which she depends so largely upon us. Without these supplies she would be in grave difficulties in continuing her war in China, to say nothing of warring against us. As for the European struggles, there is no formidable agitation for our giving military aid to either the West Front Allies or the Finns. Some are saying that if Germany wins she will take over the British navy and menace us. It is pretty safe to say that when Britain admits defeat there will be no British navy to take over.

No one can foresee what turn in world affairs may take place to involve us. But the situation does not show any such danger as will justify us in adding greatly to the huge sums we have already appropriated for defense. The navy enthusiasts who are agitating for 55,000-ton battleships (50 per cent larger than any now afloat) should be told that we do not propose to lead the nations in a still costlier armament race.

There are still great needs at home. To take one example, let us expend part of a billion dollars in eliminating our dangerous grade crossings, which doubtless have caused the loss of more American lives than we lost in the World War.

In spite of boasted Nazi power, it is still true that the strength of a nation depends upon the intelligence and loyalty of its citizens. These sources of strength can be best assured by procuring better living conditions for the multitudes of our underprivileged. Let us be concerned with this—and confine our war preparations to what is clearly needed.

Denver, Colorado. F. S. KINDER.

Keep Cool!

Editor of UNITY:

Your articles are stimulating, and in these troublous days I hope will hold the balance of equilibrium.

The majority of journals have already entered the path of hate-propaganda, and at times it seems as if the Devil himself has gripped mankind's heart, and there is no hope of recovery. However, when we study more closely the darkness that surrounds this bloody planet, we still see lights here and there that may illumine the path towards the goal.

I hope your magazine will not surrender to the surrounding atmosphere of inhumanity.

P. MALOFF.

Thrums, B. C., Canada.

The Fight Against Syphilis

Editor of UNITY:

February 1 will be National Social Hygiene Day, promoted and serviced by the American Social Hygiene Association, 50 West 50th Street, New York City, and sponsored by the National Anti-Syphilis Committee. On this and other days in February, thousands of meetings, conferences, and round tables will strengthen the attack on syphilis and gonorrhea, emphasize the slogan "Now More Than Ever—Guard Against Syphilis!"

What are the things you might do to help make National Social Hygiene Day a factor in lowering the incidence of venereal disease?

1. *Attend a Social Hygiene Day meeting* in your community—and if you find none scheduled, suggest a program to some group of which you are a member. (Program outlines and supplies may be secured from the Association without cost.)
2. *Write a letter to the editor* of your favorite newspaper, trade journal, or club publication asking him to do an editorial or have a news or feature story written. Material has been sent to thousands of editors. You can get yours to use it.
3. *Send for printed matter* for distribution to employees, youth groups, and organizations of any kind with which you have contact.
4. *Inquire about renting or purchasing* the new film "With These Weapons," a presentation of the National Anti-Syphilis Committee.
5. *Try to get a contribution* for the 1940 budget.

The Anti-Syphilis Campaign goes on all year round. However, National Social Hygiene Day not only is the peak of the educational activity, but also the best time to win new supporters of the "8-point program on 48 fronts."

Help "Guard Against Syphilis."

RAY LYMAN WILBUR,
New York City, N. Y. *Chairman.*

The Field

(*Continued from page* 177)

that this relation involves responsibilities superior to those arising from any human relation.

I am a pacifist!

I am not imbued with an eternal warlike spirit!

I declare that war is the defeat of civilization, and I know that even those who win, lose. Therefore, I do not take sides in war, but take sides with humanity *against* war, conserving my place in the ranks of those who combat this unique enemy and reiterating the while our simple watchword: *Wars will cease when men refuse to fight.* I will exert myself to spread this faith over the expanse of the earth.

I am a pacifist!

I hold that every living being has a claim upon my mercy and I a claim of brotherhood upon all creatures that live. I love life and I do not want to die, but I would die gladly rather than close my hands about a gun. I believe it is better to be killed a thousand times than to pour liquid fire, for any reason whatsoever, upon my fellow human beings. I am not ignorant of, nor indifferent to, national and personal peril, but I see a greater peril, in what my own government or my own people may perpetrate upon themselves and upon their ideals. I know that in the last analysis I have to face my fate alone and I am convinced *now* and for *all* future that I will do so without fear and without regret.

I am a pacifist!

I keep alive in my breast the will to peace and the will to sacrifice for peace.

Foremost, I take a vow to hold unimpaired the integrity of my own conviction. I will be kind and forgiving to my enemy and show him my sympathy in a thousand ways. I will help to create a positive and constructive undercurrent which, in time, will sweep human desires into a main flow of human aspiration. I will continue to cast and recast my ideas and plans into the shape of a peace settlement, fitted to inaugurate the dawn of a new world order. I will coöperate with other social and spiritual agencies in formulating and adapting the essential features for an alignment of nations based on democratic ideals of liberty and coöperation, and I will, from this time on, do my share in preparing the hearts and minds of the people to reserve their full alliance for a planetary commonwealth—the United States of the World.

I am a pacifist!

I am a conscientious objector to war! At the moment I belong to a tiny minority, but multiply me by millions, and you have the people of the world; multiply my faith by those same millions, and the armaments of nations will fall into dust!

New History.